

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 286

UD 011 801

AUTHOR Stone, Chuck
TITLE Psychology and the Black Community: From Arthur, 1853 to Arthur, 1969.
PUB DATE 6 Sep 71
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 6, 1971
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Ability, Cognitive Development, *Compensatory Education, Concept Formation, Creative Thinking, Educational Diagnosis, Heredity, Individualized Instruction, Intelligence Differences, Intelligence Tests, *Learning Characteristics, Learning Processes, Negro Students, *Psychological Testing, Psychology, Psychometrics, *Racial Differences, *Racism

ABSTRACT

Psychologists and a few sociologists have provided the academic respectability for the political rationale that the American body politic's civil rights indigestion needs a resurrected, separate but equal diet. Today, it is intellectually respectable to question the genetic equality of whites and blacks, to assert the cognitive incapacities of blacks and Chicanos, and to worry about the demise of democracy as the result of too much equality. This has its intellectual roots in the racist theories of Count Arthur Joseph de Gobineau, who wrote "The Inequality of the Human Races" in 1853. The putative relationship of the variables of racial genes and intellect as outlined by Dr. Arthur Jensen in 1969 is but a sophisticated rehearsal of a historically tired theme. Although there are a few white scholars concerned with the application of theories of cognition and pedagogy to the improvement of culturally divergent people, there are psychologists--mostly black--who are part of the solution rather than the problem. Black children can learn and achieve, even in slum environments, at the same rate as their advantaged white peers, provided multiple instructional strategies are employed to maximize the responsiveness of divergent cognitive styles. (Author/JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE BLACK COMMUNITY:
FROM ARTHUR, 1853 TO ARTHUR, 1969*

by Chuck Stone

We are indebted to that philosopher-king of the Black Revolution, Eldridge Cleaver, for the didactics of a morality which repudiates the politics of compromise as a basis for ethical behavior.

"You're either part of the problem or part of the solution," Cleaver simplistically declared several years ago, and he and many of his followers have continued to define all human conduct within the framework of this audacious dichotomy.

We did not need a Cleaver, however, to tell us that "the problem" historically has been and remains today American society. Greater Black scholars such as W. E. B. duBois and tougher Black freedom fighters such as Nat Turner had long ago defined "the problem" and had written and acted in terms of possible solutions.

From this country's inception, it has been governed by an exploitative psychoneurosis that has relegated women to the kitchen and the bedroom, Indians to the reservations, Blacks to the cotton fields and the ghettos and Mexican-Americans to the barrios. But never once did the white American male ever question the existence of any problem. A problem for whom? There could be no generalized perception of a problem for the White American male who had achieved his manhood in a culture in which the dehumanization of women and Blacks was authorized by

*Paper presented before the panel, Psychology is Part of the Problem, at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association in Washington, D. C., September 6, 1971.

his religion, subsidized by his politics and justified by his academics. Since it is a historical truism that no oppressed people will slumber forever, the kindling of rebellious fires of change in American society has radically shifted the distribution of power. For the first time, the supremacy of the whiteAmericanmale is being challenged simultaneously on several fronts -- by Blacks, women, young people, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans. There is "a problem" today in America only because the culturally oppressed, the sexually debased and the generationally excluded declare there is "a problem." And this is "the problem" we discuss at this panel.

There are some substantive differences in the etiology of oppression against Blacks and women. I'm certain some of my colleagues on this panel will dissent from this position, but I submit in this paper, as much for the sake of argument as well as from deep personal conviction that no group in American history has been more contemptuously colonized throughout its existence than persons of African descent. And yet, it was 1968 before an impeccably respectable committee of Americans sponsored and fully sanctioned by the United States government was able to admit that the whiteAmerican's mistreatment of the Blackamerican had dominated this country's growth. "White racism," declared the 1968 Kerner Commission, "is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II." Only the historic myopia of the Commission prevented it from embracing the more accurate

conclusion that white racism had begun accumulating in the 13 colonies and this explosive mix which fueled a Civil War and a separate but equal mentality is as much with us today as it was yesterday.

If that assessment seems unduly harsh, we might examine both the psychology and the politics of our times. The vast majority of white Americans subliminally believe in 1971 that their government has done too much too soon to fulfill its commitment to racial equality. Bewildered by the escalating perplexities of change, they have discovered new slogans to cloak both their resentment and resistance in the immunity of civic betterment. "Law and order," "neighborhood schools," "freedom of choice," "a minimum of busing to achieve racial balance," and "the genetic influence on learning ability" are just a few of the expressions whose face validity are equated with social stability but are in reality code words for a neo-racism which no longer enjoys the constitutional support of Plessy v. Ferguson.

This neo-racism is subtle, sophisticated and above all, academically respectable. In fact, the discipline of psychology has probably been more responsible for its political success than any other body of knowledge. By no means do I suggest a causal relationship between psychology and the surfacing of the new racism. On the other hand, what I do maintain is that psychologists and a few sociologists (I believe in integration) have provided the academic respectability for the political rationale that the American body politic's civil rights indigestion needs a resurrected separate but equal diet.

Today, it is academically fashionable and intellectually respectable to question the genetic equality of whites and Blacks, to suggest the genetic superiority of whites, to assert the cognitive incapacibilities of Blacks and Chicanos and to worry about the demise of democracy as the result of too much equality. A new educational climate has engulfed us, one which Hugh Lane, president of the National Scholarship and Service Fund for Negro Students calls the "counter-reconstruction period." Following the reconstruction period of the early sixties that culminated in an impressive series of civil rights laws for Blacks, white America immediately began searching for a political rationale to abort any further progress for the Black masses. The hands of time could not be turned back, but at least the clock could be stopped. The ink was hardly dry on the 1964 Civil Rights law before white America politicized a resurfaced racism with a concern suddenly discovered by editorial writers in the presidential campaign -- "the white backlash."

In 1965, the politics of this sophisticated neo-racism received its first scholarly legitimacy with a document known as the Moynihan Report.

In 1966, it was a popularized parainterpretation of that painstaking study known as the Coleman Report.

In 1969, the counter reconstruction period enjoyed its finest hour with the Jensen article in the Harvard Educational Review.

Two years later, just when the debate appeared to run out of steam and more important concerns -- such as the survival of the miniskirt -- competed for public attention, Dr. Richard Herrnstein of Harvard initiated a new cycle with an article in the Atlantic Monthly.

A couple of quick observations about Dr. Herrnstein's article are in order here. He offers no fresh insights on the problems of differential cognitive styles, rehashes Dr. Jensen's unsubstantiated theories on environment and heredity by substituting a new dichotomy ("nature vs. nurture"), side-steps the obviously racist implications of the alleged comparative advantages of one over the other for intelligence testing and then fantasizes an impoverished political judgement about where man's increased control of one factor (environment) could lead our society. (A "hereditary meritocracy").

The two words, "hereditary meritocracy," are implicitly contradictory. A more accurate description of Dr. Herrnstein's future world is "hereditary oligarchy." But such a conceptualization would offend our egalitarian senses and might remind us of those societies whose leaders made sweeping judgements about the superiority of one ethnic group over another and then proceeded to exterminate that designated inferior ethnic group with massive efficiency.

Suffice it to say that with the crushing problems of race, war (and a potential race war) and ecological survival confronting mankind in 1971, both the Jensen and Herrnstein articles represent what can only be described as the dialogic futility of historical irrelevancies.

The philosophical sum total of the Moynihan, Jensen and Herrnstein articles is an astonishing preoccupation with racial IQ differentials that is not explainable by the brutality of racial oppression, but is rather ascribable to a matriarchal Black family, or the pathologies of Black home life or a suspected inheritable intellectual inferiority. By assigning the blame for Black-white disparities to a Black matriarchal family, by eliminating a white-controlled pedagogy and school system as the cause of Black educational stagnation and by affirming the strong possibility of Black congenital intellectual inferiority to explain that nagging one standard deviation between Black and white test scores, white society neatly absolves itself of all historical and contemporary culpability for its subjugation of Blacks.

This propensity for blaming the victimized for the victimizer's actions is known as the Moynihan-Jensen syndrome. At no time in the development of new methodologies to close the cognitive gap between Black and white school children have basic educational assumptions been challenged, much less were Black psychologists and educators involved. Instead, a system which had already failed Black children simply concocted variations on an old theme to masquerade as change. Thus, sprung up one of the great educational con jobs of the decade -- compensatory education. Compensatory education did not deal with differential cognitive styles or the taxonomy of instruction. Compensatory education merely extended the working day of the teacher. As Dr. Sol Gordon of Syracuse University in a recent article, "The Bankruptcy of Compensatory Education," pointed out:

"Present federally funded educational programs emphasize three themes: compensatory education, remediation and correction of racial imbalance. Such programs blame the ghetto child's failure to learn on his mode of life, poverty and lack of motivation; on educators' failure to understand the perceptual or cognitive style of a particular subculture; and on de facto segregation.

"Compensatory education, designed to make up for deficiencies in a child's home environment, has failed precisely because it concentrates on the student's failure to learn rather than the school's failure to instruct."

The science of medicine has a concept which best describes the impact of innovations such as compensatory education, remediation and busing. It's known as the placebo effect. Placebo is an inert medication or preparation given for its psychological effect, especially to soothe the patient. Black children were given the aspirin of compensatory education to relieve the headaches of racial segregation. When the statistics of the Coleman report questioned the capacity of compensatory education to significantly elevate Black IQs, some influential white psychologists twisted the report's conclusions into a different emphasis: those niggers were sicker than we thought they were. Nothing's wrong with our medicine. There must be something wrong with their genes.

The intellectual history of man's attempt to explain cognitive achievement in terms of the genetic distribution amongst ethnic groups (an academic euphemism for racial superiority) is over 100 years old. Count Arthur Joseph de Gobineau wrote in 1853 that neither physical environment nor social conditions could explain the advances of civilization. Instead, insisted de Gobineau in his famed "The Inequality of the Human Races," the biological differences of race, especially the Aryan race explained intellectual achievement.

This is why I am dismayed at our society's obsession with the putative relationship of the variables of racial genes and intellect as outlined by Dr. Arthur Jensen in 1969. It is a sophisticated rehearsal of a historically tired theme already worn thin by countless advocates of genetic superiority. Whereas Arthur de Gobineau in 1853 could in no way measure up to the psychometric genius of Arthur Jensen in 1969 or incorporate the massive computerized statistics of demographic differences in test performances to support his theories as did Dr. Jensen, the theoretical implications of their theories are ominously similar: the clear suggestion that one race is possibly superior to another.

Today, in 1971, is this a legitimate pursuit of educational research? Were such morally obnoxious theories irrefutably verifiable by statistics, what would we do -- build education concentration camps for Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and Native Americans? Are psychologists helping to create a harmonious society based upon mutual respect and honest affection

when they busy themselves with research studies that further polarize an already deeply divided society of two races? Is the psychological school of genetic intelligence perpetuating the problem or creating the solution?

To dwell on the answers to such questions is only a complicitous furtherance of respectability to a few men whose academic inquiries have yet to solve the educational evisceration of Black and Spanish-speaking Americans. Fortunately, there are a few white scholars who are concerned with the application of theories of cognition and pedagogy to the improvement of culturally divergent people. What I am now suggesting is that there are psychologists -- both Black and white, far more, however, who are Black -- who are part of the solution rather than the problem.

Instead of bewailing the academic influence of that little band of white elitists who inadvertently provide scholarly support for the untutored mouthings of the John Waynes, the George Wallaces and the Spiro Agnews, we should be replicating those studies and applying those theories which are trying to solve the problem.

Moynihan, Jensen and now Herrnstein have merely reminded us there is a problem and they aggravate its existence.

We must now turn our attention to psychologists such as Rohwer, Crutchfield, Heber and Tannenbaum who are offering some solutions to the problem. Psychology can be part of the solution and these four scholars represent academic evidence of this pleasant expectancy.

In 1965, Dr. Richard S. Crutchfield of the University of California at Berkeley, reported on research undertaken to develop special new instructional materials and procedures suitable for fifth and sixth grade children. In a paper titled, "Instructing the Individual in Creative Thinking," Dr. Crutchfield explained the research study's rationale:

"It is increasingly recognized that to make the instructional process optimal, account must be taken of the specific background, capabilities and distinctive cognitive style of the given individual. In order that any bit of instructional information -- no matter how small -- be properly understood and mastered by the individual, he must be enabled to assimilate it relevantly to his own cognitive structure, to transform it according to his own preferred and distinctive cognitive style in such a way as to 'make it his own.' "

Utilizing what he called a "programmed self-instructional form" for a total of 481 children -- 267 who were in the experimental group and 214 in the control group -- Dr. Crutchfield's study was carried out over a two-year period in the public schools of Berkeley and vicinity. As seems to be true of most tests, Dr. Crutchfield found an appreciable correlation between IQ and his criterion test scores. But, he wrote, "it is notable that the effect of training over-rides the effect of intelligence to such a degree that low-IQ children after training actually surpass the untrained high-IQ children."

He then continues with this interesting observation: "The Negro children -- predominantly from disadvantageous backgrounds -- also markedly gain from the program, though only about half as much as do the white children. But note that even though on pre-tests the Negro children score appreciably lower than the white children, subsequently the trained Negro children gain enough to surpass the untrained whites on the post-test creativity measures."

In Milwaukee, Dr. Rick Heber, professor of education and child psychology at the University of Wisconsin, has been conducting what is known as the Milwaukee Project in that city's most depressed section with poor, illiterate parents. (In our society, that usually means Blacks.)

Using census data, Dr. Heber and his team of associates selected the residential section of Milwaukee with the lowest median family income, the greatest population density per housing unit and the most dilapidated housing. They then established an Infant Education Center in 1966 and began working with 40 mothers with IQs of less than 70 whose participation began at the time of their children's birth. An earlier survey, incidentally, had revealed that maternal intelligence was the most reliable single indicator of the level and character of intellectual development of the children. One might add, *ceterus paribus*.

Dr. Heber's project sought to ascertain to what extent intervention under the right circumstances could be successful in the most difficult situations and thus prove that disadvantaged children are capable of high educational achievement.

The children were divided into two groups, two-thirds in the experimental and one-third in the control. From the time of their birth, the children in the experimental group were exposed to mental stimulation of a wide variety for several hours each day with special teachers. When the children in the experimental group reached 19 to 25 months of age, their vocabulary production began to accelerate rapidly.

At three and one-half years, the children in the experimental group measured an average of 33 IQ points higher than the children in the control group. A few registered IQs as high as 135. While Dr. Heber found that the reason for the unusually high concentration of what is called mental retardation among slum children is the retarded parent residing in the slum environment instead of the slum environment itself, he also proved, as did Dr. Crutchfield, that successful intervention of a creative pedagogy can arrest the growth of cognitive deficiencies in Black, low income slum children.

At Columbia University, Dr. Abraham J. Tannenbaum is director of the Taxonomic Instruction Project which is concentrating on the role of the teacher in the instructional process. The Taxonomic staff is attempting to test a fundamental hypothesis -- the teacher's ability to regulate a pupil's responsiveness to instructional stimuli by classifying the various behavioral options available to the teacher during the teaching process. Here again, the emphasis is on individualized instruction which results from a diversity of approaches. While the

Taxonomic Instruction Project is working with what it describes as "behaviorally disordered" children, its innovative approach to the critical role of the teacher as both a pedagogical and a socializing agent will have enormous implications for the millions of Black and Chicano children who today are not being taught in school.

The final study which I wish to submit to this panel is probably one of the most important completed in the last six years, ever since the counter reconstruction period began. The study was conducted by Dr. William D. Rohwer, Jr. of the University of California at Berkeley. It is reported in the June, 1971, issue of the Review of Educational Research in an article titled "Learning, Race and School Success."

The name, Rohwer, will not evoke the same widespread enthusiasm as the name Jensen nor will Dr. Rohwer be invited by the Atlantic Monthly to write an article nor has the New York Times bothered to report on Dr. Rohwer's research because Dr. Rohwer does a curious thing -- he not only provides documentable evidence to contradict Dr. Jensen's theories on race and cognitive skills, he even demonstrates how the Black-white achievement gap can be significantly narrowed. In the political climate of today which is searching for academic apostles of neo-racism to justify the continued educational subordination of Black children, Dr. Rohwer's authoritative article represents both a strong refutation of the rationale for Black genetic inferiority and an affirmation of the capabilities of pedagogical flexibility to improve the cognitive skills of all children.

Dr. Rohwer poses a question central to the racial conflict in education: "Why," he asks, "does school success depend more directly on ethnicity, SES and IQ than on the ability to learn?"

Describing several different studies he conducted of low-SES Black children and middle-SES whites, Dr. Rohwer attempts to identify the variables responsible for what he terms learning ability or the learning quotient (LQ) rather than the IQ which is the result of pre-school developed learning tactics and the mastery of classroom skills prior to the school entry.

He challenges rather successfully several of Dr. Jensen's hypotheses on learning ability -- the dichotomous model involving associative and conceptual ability and the capacity for self-initiated elaboration as a skill necessary to handle level II or conceptual ability in learning. Fulfilling his own hypotheses, Dr. Jensen had indicated that middle-SES children are superior to low-SES children in Level II ability.

Dr. Rohwer, however, found sharply contradictory evidence in a research study which corroborates both Dr. Crutchfield's and Dr. Heber's findings concerning the learning proficiency or quotient (LQ) of low-income Black children. Using a cohort of low-SES Black children and high-SES white children in the second grade randomly assigned to three groups, Dr. Rohwer then administered one form of the Paired-Associates test as a pretest and the other form as the posttest. Group A was the control group and they

simply received the two tests without any intervention between the two test administrations. Group B was the practice group which received no instruction, but simply practiced learning lists of paired associates. Group C, the training group, received instruction in what Dr. Rohwer called elaboration activities -- envisioning objects when presented with their names, naming the perceived objects, describing episodes for pairs of objects and envisioning these episodes. The results for the three groups have fascinating implications for American education which has systematically destroyed Black children.

Whereas significant gains in the posttest scores were registered by the high-SES white samples in the practice and training groups relative to the control group, the high-SES whites in the training group did no better on the posttest than the high-SES whites in practice group.

On the other hand -- and I don't think I have ever exulted more in that qualifying phrase -- the posttest scores of the low-SES Black sample in the training group were actually raised to the performance level of high-SES whites in the control group.

Furthermore, in the training group, the pretest score differential between low-SES Blacks and high-SES whites was 13 points. In the posttest, the differential was shaved to 4.9 points. The Jensenites would probably rejoice in that residual differential of 4.9 points as genetically controlled. But the experiment's success in conclusively demonstrating the merits of instructional alternatives speaks for itself.

As did Dr. Crutchfield, Dr. Rohwer strengthens the theory's validity of learning as a function of cognitive styles. The educational implications of his model, he writes, does imply that "learning proceeds best when conditions are such that conceptual activity is elicited in the learner," in contradistinction to Dr. Jensen's theory of self-initiated elaboration. "Some students," continues Dr. Rohwer, "should be presented information for learning in such a way as to permit acquisition by means of imaginative conceptual activity, while for other students the subject matter would be presented so that it can be acquired by means of formal conceptual activity. The model also implies that for low-SES students, care should be taken to provide ample opportunities for acquiring information and skills missed because of inadequate early environmental experience." This was precisely what the Milwaukee Project sought to accomplish and it did.

History has taught us that the oppressor never indicts himself, intentionally surrenders a transfer of power or willingly subsidizes the destruction of his system. Consequently, an America seeking to maintain the plantation status quo more eagerly embraces the postulates of a Dr. Jensen than his equally authoritative critics.

For example, earlier this year in a New York City symposium, three professors -- Dr. Lawrence Plotkin of City University of New York, Dr. Doxey Wilkerson of Columbia and Dr. Lamar Miller of New York University -- all sharply criticized Jensen's theories and their comments were largely

ignored. (At least, the Atlantic Monthly and the Harvard Educational Review found little merit in them.) According to the three professors, two of whom are Black, the self-fulfilling prophecy of white teachers' expectations of low cognitive achievement among Black children, based on Jensen's theories, was causing a "grave negative effect" on how Black children are taught.

How many of you in this room are worried about such an untoward development in American education?

How many of you care? More appropriately what is the American Psychological Association going to do about it?

The answer to that last question might be titled "1971: The Association of Black Psychologists Revisited."

Two years ago, the newly formed Association of Black Psychologists presented to the governing Council of APA a "petition of concerns" which included seven action proposals. The first proposal called for a mere moral declaration, the APA official endorsement of the Kerner Commission Report's conclusion that white racism is primarily responsible for the injustice and racial unrest in America. The fourth proposal asked the APA to establish a committee to study "the misuse of standardized psychological instruments to maintain and justify the practice of systematically denying educational and economic opportunities to Black youth." Pending such a reassessment, the ABPsi called for a moratorium on comparative testing.

That the APA has not moved with all due deliberate speed -- if it has moved at all -- is evident by the increase of the assessment problems affecting the Black and Spanish-speaking children who are still being tested as mentally retarded and denied educational advancement by an unconscionable misuse of tests. Black teachers and Black school administrators are being denied and deprived of jobs -- again by the callously inappropriate use of tests. The use of tests as the principal and frequently only assessment instrument to determine intellectual proficiency, educational accessibility, job placement and professional advancement is a widespread racist cancer in the American body politic. Buttressing this spear-visioned use of tests has been the recent literary cloudburst of articles on race, genetics and test predictive validity as an implicit justification for continued test misuse.

During the last two years, what has the APA accomplished? As psychometricians who can measure human activity, you can also quantify the substance of your commitment to racial equality and the degree of follow-up to the ABPsi 1969 requests. The sympathetic attitude of the APA Council in 1969 was appreciated, but even the plantation masters occasionally treated their slaves with genuine affection. About the only evidence of assessable response to the ABPsi requests was a typically white orgy in guilt that elected the organization's first Negro president. The continued over-use of one Negro scholar as a modern-day Booker T. Washington is precisely the reason why the formation of the Association of Black Psychologists

was mandatory. Dr. Kenneth Clark is indeed an accomplished scholar who made a historic contribution to American education 17 years ago. Marian Anderson also was a distinguished singer and when the Metropolitan Opera decided to integrate its company, it accorded Miss Anderson the honor, but long after she was past her artistic prime. One would have hoped the APA would not have succumbed to that sociological propensity for making face validity gestures of racial equality by acclaiming pasteurized Negro scholars, especially in this era of the Black Liberation ethic. What an irony that you would elect a man who has consistently opposed Black studies and the intellectual genius of the Black experience. Was this your naive answer to the ABPsi? The most dramatic evidence of a genuine APA response would have been the election as president of a brilliant psychologist, a together Black brother, and a gentle humanitarian, Dr. Charles W. Thomas, one of the co-founders of the ABPsi. The gulf might have been bridged.

Two years after the founding of the ABPsi and the publication of Dr. Jensen's article, what can the APA and the discipline of psychology do to become part of the solution instead of the problem?

The answers are so simple. As professionals, are you so enamored with your scholarly objectivity that you recognize no need to be *amicus curiae* in court cases where tests are being challenged as shameful exercises to exclude Blacks as teachers? How long do you expect to stand aloof in splendid isolation from the racial storm and drang of our times?

The Black and Chicano communities of the country are determined not only to survive as human beings, but to prevail as citizens. To do so, we will and must confront the enemy of racism at all levels with a multiplicity of means.

We will build and maintain our own institutions and we will simultaneously seek to remain a part of yours to the extent we are not oppressed by them. Thus, there will be Black-controlled school systems, Black mayors, integrated school systems and bi-racial-controlled school systems. This is consonant with the educational pluralism of America that recognizes the academic excellence of Catholic colleges and Jewish schools.

But educational change, new ideas in the psychology of teaching and learning and a new philosophy of testing must come. The APA would render an outstanding service by convening a summit conference on testing and minority groups. Such a conference would outline a series of applied research proposals and specific guidelines to be utilized by city and state education officials, college admissions officers, personnel officers in business and other guidance counselors for the appropriate interpretation and application of tests for minority groups.

The APA should also encourage an organizational effort to develop a BQ or bigotry quotient test to assess the individual's social adaptability. I wish I could claim credit for this idea, but it belongs to Dr. TheodoreSizer dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. We

have concentrated so compulsively on measuring the proficiency of the three "r's" (reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic), we've completely neglected to teach or measure the fourth "r" -- what I call the missing element of American education -- respect. The BQ test would measure that fourth "r". Needless to say, had the fourth "r" been a part of our curriculum and our tests, this country would not have endured the racial hate which has characterized and controlled its growth.

Were the APA to put its prestigious stamp of academic approval on such an effort, American education overnight would begin to divest itself of some of its colonialistic vestiges.

An important Black official in one of the most powerful educational organizations in the country very recently wrote me a letter commenting on a speech I had delivered to the Eastern Psychological Association. His penetrating reaction represents an increasingly significant segment of opinion in this country. My good friend wrote, *inter alia*:

"While I agree with your speech, you and I can't afford to lose sight of the real enemy, the testing industry, which dignifies the mislabeling of minority children sentencing them to the never-never land of slow learners and 'retards'; which screens out black and minority students from the most prestigious colleges.

"Testing must police its ranks or be destroyed by a series of frontal attacks in the courts."

It is important to note that my friend is not suggesting we do away with testing, but calling on the industry to police its ranks. I part company just a wee bit with my good brother because I believe the APA's organizational sanction of the misuse of tests and the condoning of implicitly racist research projects and publications, all in the name of academic inquiry, are equally culpable.

Among minority professionals, there is no question about the need for some kind of assessment strategy to evaluate mental proficiency. Measurement instruments are mandatory for the scientific development of a cybernated society whose cognitive skills demand technological mastery. Tests tell us whether the doctor knows how to operate, the lawyer can gain an acquittal, the pilot can fly a jet, the computer programmer can wire the necessary terminals, the pharmacist can compound the right medicine, and the bacteriologist can discover the critical serum.

At the same time, tests must not be permitted to help maintain educational concentration camps or cultural ovens for Black and Spanish-speaking children.

Moynihan, Jensen and Herrnstein, notwithstanding, Black children can learn and achieve, even in slum environments, at the same rate as their advantaged white peers, provided multiple instructional strategies are employed to maximize the responsiveness of divergent cognitive styles.

If the APA and the discipline of psychology want to be a part of the solution instead of the problem, let your energies be enlisted in an educational renaissance which will merge the intellectual talents and methodological approaches of the Richard Crutchfields, the Rick Hebers and the William Rohwers with the comparable talents and Black commitment of the Charles Thomases, the Reginald Joneses and the Robert Williamses. In so doing, maybe we can build an interactive taxonomy of teaching and learning successes that will not only prevent the systematic destruction of other brilliant young Soledad brothers like Geroge Jackson, but will help us all to live in what Frantz Fanon described as "a world of reciprocal recognitions."